



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

loquitur." Isidorus has been evidently furnishing new materials for the troubadour's *Partimen*. We are face to face with a "contamination."

The problem becomes more complicated as soon as the Italian *derivations* are examined. Professor Rajna quotes five sonnets.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the number might still be increased by other valuable contributions from unedited codices. But there are hardly any important links missing in the careful *exposé*, though probably the primitive samples of vulgar poetical reshaping of the antique mold are irrevocably lost. But the few specimens given allow us to discern sundry parallels. There are sonnets more or less directly descended from Savaric; there are others which combine Fortunaziano's type with some of Savaric's characteristics. The existence, co-existence or non-existence of the *garland* forms the cardinal point with regard to Boccaccio's revival of the hazardous topic. In two cases the kinship with Boccaccio becomes obvious. The so-called Adrianus' sonnet is, perhaps, the latent model into which Boccaccio's genial power infused new life, whilst Petro Montanaro's poem very likely emanates from the *Filocolo*.

M. J. MINCKWITZ.

München.

---

---

### CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS:—The following list of thirty one questions is an exact copy of the blank sent by the president of a western State university to candidates for positions as teachers in his Faculty. Not a word, not a syllable, has been altered.

"University of..... Application Blank.  
Signature.....  
Position desired.....  
Date.....

1 What was your age last birthday?

<sup>2</sup> We are indebted to him for the *editio princeps* of the sonnet by Antonio dalla Foresta to Lorenzo Moschi (Codice Riccardiano 1103, 107<sup>a</sup>), for the reëdition (with variants) of P. Montanaro's sonnet, and, besides, for numerous careful text-revisions.

- 2 What is your height?
- 3 Your weight?
- 4 Your complexion?
- 5 Are you of a nervous or phlegmatic temperament?
- 6 In what condition is your health?
- 7 Kindly send a recent photograph?
- 8 Are you fond of society?
- 9 Are you considered popular?
- 10 Do young people like you?
- 11 Are you considered a good public speaker?
- 12 Have you ever conducted teacher's institutes or taken part in them in any way? State your experience.
- 13 Can you help increase the attendance of a university by canvassing for students?
- 14 Are you fertile in making suggestions?
- 15 What church do you attend?
- 16 Are you a member?
- 17 Do you smoke or chew?
- 18 Do you drink?
- 19 Have you any other habits good or bad?
- 20 What is your nationality, and where were you born?
- 21 Are you married?
- 22 If not, have you been?
- 23 How many children have you?
- 24 Where have you taught before, and how long at each place?
- 25 What was your salary at the last place?
- 26 Were you successful?
- 27 In what do you consider yourself stronger, scholarship or discipline?
- 28 If elected to a position, would you make the advancement of the institution of as much importance as the improvement of yourself, scholastically and materially?
- 29 Should you be willing to assist students at all times, even if considerable attention outside of regular hours were required?
- 30 How many hours a week are you willing to teach regularly?
- 31 Of what teachers' agencies are you a member?"

Such is the blank!

Our first feeling on reading it is amusement, our second indignation. What could be more amusing than: "Are you fertile in making suggestions?", "Do you smoke or chew?"—perhaps this should

be punctuated: Do you smoke, or chew?—; “Have you any other habits good or bad?”; “Are you married? If not, have you been?” Again, how naïve must be the originator of this blank if he supposes that he will receive truthful answers to such questions as: “Are you considered popular?”; “Do young people like you?”; “Were you successful?” Of course, the information asked for in many of these questions would be desirable to know, but the impossibility of obtaining it from the candidate himself is apparent.

Our indignation and contempt are aroused when, on looking closer at these questions, sent out from a supposed seat of higher learning, we notice the kind of a man evidently desired by the president. We can easily discern what this man must be: he must be of irreproachable mediocrity, or rather sub-mediocrity:—He must be fond of society, must be considered popular, must pique himself on his oratory. He must have frequented teachers’ institutes,—*absit omen*!—; he must be willing to canvas for students; he must be fertile in suggestions; must be a regular attendant and member of an orthodox church; must not smoke or chew or drink; must be a person of such training and limitations as to discuss seriously the question: “In what do you consider yourself stronger, scholarship or discipline?” He must be at so low an ebb “scholastically and materially” as to promise that, if named, he will be willing to assist students at all hours. In addition, he must agree to teach “regularly” a fabulous number of hours. Finally, he is supposed to be a member of teachers’ agencies. Such is the type of man that would meet the ideal of the president who wrote this blank. Now, while some of these qualifications are desirable in a university teacher, we may safely assert that a man who fulfilled them all could only be a man of limited training, a man who should never be placed in a professor’s chair, not even in a poorer sectarian “college,” or “normal” school.

The folly of many of these questions has already been mentioned. Their charlatanism is no less marked. The disastrous effect of such a college administration as is here suggested is beyond doubt. The best faculty in the land, renewed on the lines of this blank, would soon sink to the level of the poorer sectarian “college,” or the correspondence school.

One cannot so much blame the president who emits such a list of questions, as the board which appointed him, and, back of the board, public opinion. Let us suppose that a president is to be chosen for a typical college or university in this country. One might expect that the appointing boards would look into the qualifications of all citizens possessed of the requisite training, talent and character,—that there would be no restriction of the field of candidates. In fact, however, the field is halved, quartered, and halved again. The main object of the boards seems to be to secure a “safe man.” To this end, all possible appointees who are not devout members of some one—too frequently of some particular one—of the larger evangelical sects, and who do not belong to the political party locally in power, are at once set aside. This is a very serious limitation of the field. Without going further and showing how the candidates remaining are emasculated by the rejection of the keenest and most vigorous—for they might not prove “safe”—we can readily see that the president of the average American university or college must be relatively a weak brother, distinctly below the level of his better professors. He is too often a man who has tried several careers and failed, and his mouth is generally filled with pedagogic terms and religious cant. He is frequently a time-server, a man whose influence cannot fail to be injurious to youth, whose entire life will not show one example of vigorous, independent thinking, of courageous and virile action, of conspicuous virtue. This man surrounds himself with a faculty composed largely of sycophants, misfits and charlatans. These men govern, and the cause of education is ruined in that institution for a generation.

Why is it that we continue to send our children to such schools? It is mainly because, as a nation, we are too young to have learned the great lesson that all things are not created equal—that there is in education, as in every thing else, a standard article, and that the standard article is always the best. We do not realize that there are startling and decisive differences among universities, and that the best are none too good.

RAYMOND WEEKS.

*University of Missouri.*